DEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

* * *

RE: THE INVESTIGATION AND SUSPENSION OF PROPOSED CHANGES AND ADDITIONS TO EXCHANGE AND NETWORK SERVICES TARIFF - TELEPHONE, MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, DENVER, COLORADO 80202.

INVESTIGATION AND SUSPENSION DOCKET NO. 1766

COMMISSION ORDER ESTABLISHING EXCHANGE AREAS

July 19, 1989

STATEMENT

BY THE COMMISSION:

In Decision No. C89-178 issued in this docket, as modified by Decision No. C89-405, the Commission recognized that appropriate exchange areas would of necessity be determined from an evolving set of circumstances, and further recognized the likely reconfiguration of exchange areas in that decision as ongoing needs became apparent. Therefore, on February 15, 1989, the Commission established Docket No. 89M-083T to create a task force to provide for an ongoing review of exchange areas in the state and to make recommendations concerning further exchange area changes. The task force consisted of members of the Fixed Utilities Staff of the Commission (Staff) designated by the Chief of Fixed Utilities.

Various telephone utilities and other entities intervened in Docket No. 89M-083T including, among others, The Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Company d/b/a U S WEST Communications (USWC) and the Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC). The task force submitted three reports to the Commission which suggested modifications to certain exchange areas. Comments concerning these recommendations were filed by USWC and the OCC.

Public hearings have already been held throughout the state in accordance with § 40-15-206(2), C.R.S. concerning the initial reconfiguration of exchange areas established in Decision No. C89-178. However, based upon the task force recommendations, the Commission found that it was advisable to consider further exchange area changes as an extension of the Investigation and Suspension Docket No. 1766 (I&S 1766) proceedings and reopened I&S 1766 for that limited purpose. The changes at issue were identified in Appendices A and B to Decision No. C89-892 which reopened I&S 1766. By that decision, further public hearings were

set on June 30, 1989 and July 3, and July 14, 1989. A subsequent hearing was held on July 14, 1989, to receive a stipulation from USWC, the OCC, and the Staff concerning the changes identified in Appendices A and B.

At the start of the hearing in this reopened proceeding, the Commission advised the parties that they were to identify what changes in exchange areas were advisable, what would be the costs involved to make the changes, and how any losses in toll revenues should be spread among ratepayers or rate groups. Finally, the Commission reminded the parties that it did not intend to delay implementation of the final Commission exchange area plan past January 1, 1990. Three members of the public from the Lake George exchange area appeared and presented testimony concerning their exchange area. The Commission conducted the hearing in an informal, roundtable manner, without objection. At the conclusion of the hearing, the matter was taken under advisement.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. In Decision No. C89-178 the Commission stated that what has commonly been known as a "local calling area" is functionally equivalent to the statutory term "exchange area." Section 40-15-102(8), C.R.S., defines an "exchange area" as a geographic area established by the Commission, which consists of one or more central offices together with associated facilities which are used in providing basic local exchange service. Section 40-15-206(2), C.R.S., provides that rearrangements of exchange areas different from those in existence on July 2, 1987, shall require a public hearing and a determination by the Commission that such rearrangement will promote the public interest and welfare and will not adversely impact the public switched network of the affected local exchange provider or such provider's financial integrity.
- 2. Also in Decision No. C89-178, the Commission found that the community of interest standard established in the <u>Otero</u> case, Case No. 6415, was still appropriate for defining exchange areas in this proceeding. Under this standard, local exchange service should generally be offered to meet the primary communications needs of subscribers. Primary communications needs were identified to include calls for such purposes as health and safety, business, community, social, and governmental activities. On page 58 of Decision No. C89-178, the Commission elaborated upon the community of interest standard by stating objective criteria that would be used to determine a community of interest.
- 3. In addition, the Commission generally believes it advisable to correct reciprocity problems which may have been previously existing or may be created by changing exchange areas from those in existence on July 2, 1987. A "reciprocity problem" exists where a local non-toll call may be made in one direction, but not in the other between any two points. For example, if the calls from Calhan to Colorado Springs are included in Calhan's local exchange area, but the calls from Colorado Springs to Calhan are not, (and therefore are toll calls) the public may well perceive this to be an example of illogical action without

reasonable basis, rather than good planning: Moreover, the public seems invariably to discover ways to avoid the toll calls in these circumstances by "code calling". In this instance, the call volume data may not suggest changing the exchange area, but the goal of simple, understandable regulation suggests changing the exchange area, particularly if the area is contiguous to the existing exchange area.

- 4. The Commission has expressed a preference to modify exchange areas in such a way so as to minimize the revenue losses created, if any, and thereby minimize any further rate increases to the ratepayers. The Commission recognizes that other considerations such as those stated in paragraphs 2 and 3 may indicate appropriate rate adjustments. We, nonetheless, have kept this in mind when applying the standards we have discussed.
- Finally, we have been confronted with whether it is appropriate to include entire "historic exchanges" within a community of interest, even where the call volumes demonstrate that only a portion of the historic exchange is actually called. For example, the Colorado Springs historic exchange is divided into twelve wire centers (generally "central offices" under the statute, although technically a "wire center" may be made up of one or more "central offices" which are synonymous with switches. [See, § 40-15-104(8), C.R.S. and The Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Colorado Exchange and Network Services Tariff, page 14. Release 4)]; namely, Main, East, Pikeview, Security, Air Force Academy, Fountain, Stratmoor, Monument, Black Forest, Green Mountain Falls, Manitou Springs, and Woodland Park. Persons living in the Lake George exchange area may only call the Colorado Springs Main and East wire centers in significant volumes. Staff generally argues those persons should have an exchange area which includes the entire historic exchange if they have significant call volumes to a portion of the historic exchange. USWC and the OCC argue that we can and should only include the wire centers which have sufficient call volumes, not the entire historic exchange -- that is not the "whole pie" but only the appropriate "slice". We find this argument persuasive in appropriate circumstances. There is nothing in the statute that requires exchange areas to be mutually exclusive geographic areas. See § 40-15-102(8), C.R.S. We note that this can also affect the correction of reciprocity problems. If Bailey has access to the entire historic Denver Metro 65 exchange, in order to prevent a reciprocity problem, the historic Denver Metro 65 exchange simply gets bigger with the addition of Bailey. This may not always be desirable. However, we note also that we generally favor expansion of local exchange areas for ease of understanding and to promote larger communities with due regard to communities of interest, which may go beyond municipal, special district, county or other boundaries, and which may affect regional communities of interest.
- 6. It is with these principles in mind that we determine that certain exchange areas should be modified as stated in Appendix A to this decision. Generally, call volumes have dictated changes; however, correction of reciprocity problems has also been a factor, as well as a common sense approach based on the record of all information provided.

Doubtless not all will agree with our decisions based on the present record. We and others understand that changing circumstances will suggest ongoing evolution of designated exchange areas.

- 7. The changes in Appendix A result in revenue losses in the total approximate amount of \$3.1 million. The revenue losses should be allocated among the rate groups as stated in Appendix B to this decision. Residential customers will receive an additional monthly rate increase of 11¢ per line, (8¢ per month per line for lifeline rates) and business customers will receive an additional monthly rate increase of 32¢ per line, both of which are significantly lower than those originally proposed by the OCC.
- B. Finally, the San Miguel County Commissioners filed a petition to intervene in this docket on July 13, 1989. This petition states good grounds, and should be granted.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- The modifications to exchange areas stated in Appendix A to this Decision contain one or more central offices and associated facilities which are used to provide basic local exchange service.
- 2. The rearrangement of the exchange areas stated in Appendix A to this Decision and the rates adjustments provided therefor will promote the public interest and welfare and will not adversely impact the public switched network of The Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Company or any other local exchange provider or their financial integrity.
- The rates established in this decision and stated in Appendix B are just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory.

THEREFORE THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:

- 1. The Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Company shall file an advice letter with appropriate tariff sheets and exchange area maps, before December 15, 1989, to be effective on January 1, 1990, which shall implement the exchange areas, rates, and other tariff changes adopted by the Commission in Decision No. C89-178 as modified by Decision No. C89-405 and by the Findings of Fact and Conclusions stated in this Decision and Appendices A and B.
- 2. The tariffs shall state the decision number of this Decision and Decision No. C89-178 as authority for the changes and shall state an effective date of January 1, 1990. The tariffs shall be filed without further notice and shall be self-executing in all respects, but shall be subject to suspension by the Commission if appropriate.
- The San Miguel County Commissioners are granted intervenor status. They take this docket as they find it.

4. The 20-day time period provided for in § 40-6-114, C.R.S., within which to file an application for rehearing, reargument, or reconsideration shall begin on the first day after the mailing or service of this Decision by the Commission.

This Decision is effective immediately.

DONE IN OPEN MEETING July 19, 1989.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

noed \$. Co

Commissioners

1130n

Appendix A I&S Docket No. 1766 Decision No. C89-998 July 19, 1989 Page 1 of 7

Exchange Name	DROPS	ADDS		
AGUILAR	LA VETA	BRANSON		
AKRON		FT. MORGAN		
ALAMOSA		CENTER DEL NORTE SAN LUIS SOUTH FORK CREEDE		
ALLENSPARK		BLDR-TABLE MESA		
ASPEN		GLENWOOD SPGS		
BAILEY		DECKERS		
BASALT		GLENWOOD SPGS		
BAYFIELD	£	SILVERTON		
BERTHOUD BOULDER	JOHNSTOWN-MILLIKEN	FT COLLINS		
TABLE MESA W.C. GUNBARREL W.C.		ERIE ERIE		
BRANSON		AGUILAR WESTON		
BROOMFIELD Northglenn W.C	. ERIE FREDERICK			
BUENA VISTA		FAIRPLAY LEADVILLE .		
BURLINGTON		CHEYENNE WELLS		
CALHAN	Monument W.C.	C.SPIKEVIEW C.SMAIN C.SEAST C.SA.F.ACAD C.SSECURITY		
CANON CITY	CRIPPLE CRK STRATMOOR	Vineland W.C.		

Appendix A 1&S Docket No. 1766 Decision No. C89-998 July 19, 1989 Page 2 of 7

Exchange Name

DROPS

ADDS

CASTLE ROCK LARKSPUR W.C. KIOWA ELIZABETH

CENTRAL CITY

BOULDER LOOKOUT HTN EVERGREEN

COLO SPRINGS:

BLACK FOREST

CALHAN

WOODLAND PARK

LAKE GEORGE

PIKEVIEW

CALHAN PEYTON

CRIPPLE CREEK LAKE GEORGE

MAIN

CALHAN LAKE GEORGE PEYTON

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

CRIPPLE CREEK CALHAN PEYTON

EAST

CALHAN

CRIPPLE CREEK LAKE GEORGE

GREEN MTN FALLS

CRIPPLE CREEK LAKE GEORGE

MANITOU SPRINGS

CRIPPLE CREEK LAKE GEORGE

SECURITY

CALHAN

CRIPPLE CREEK LAKE GEORGE

COTTONWOOD(LAF/LSVL) FT. LUPTON

CRAIG

RANGELY/DINOSAUR

CREEDE

CENTER

ALAMOSA

CRESTED BUTTE

ASPEN

MONTROSE

Appendix A I&S Docket No. 1766 Decision No. C89-998 July 19, 1989 Page 3 of 7

Exchange Name	DROPS	ADDS
	BASALT CARBONDALE	
CRIPPLE CREEK		LAKE GEORGE C.SEAST C.SPIKEVIEW C.SSECURITY
DeBEQUE	RIFLE	GRD JUNCTION
DECKERS	MORRISON EVERGREEN	
DELTA		MONTROSE OLATHE
DENVER - SOUTHWES	T ZONE ,	DECKERS BAILEY IDAHO SPRINGS
DENVER-LAKEWOOD Z	ONE	BAILEY CENTRAL CITY IDAHO SPRINGS
DENVER-ENGLEWOOD	ZONE	DECKERS
DENVER-COLUMBINE	ZONE	BAILEY DECKERS
DENVER-ARVADA ZON	E	CENTRAL CITY IDAHO SPRGS
DENVER-GOLDEN ZON	E	GEORGETOWN BAILEY IDAHO SPRINGS
DENVER-LITTLETON (INCL. DRY CR.AB HIGHLANDS AND L	ERDEEN,	DECKERS
DILLON		GEORGETOWN

DURANGO

ERIE

CORTEZ

BOULDER

DOLORES MESA VERDE

Appendix A I&S Docket No. 1766 Decision No. C89-998 July 19, 1989 Page 4 of 7

Exchange Name	DROPS	ADDS
ESTES PARK	BERTHOUD LONGMONT	FT COLLINS
EVERGREEN	CENTRAL CITY	GEORGETOWN
FAIRPLAY	LEADVILLE LAKE GEORGE	
FLORENCE		VINELAND
FORT COLLINS		RED FEATHER LKS WALDEN ESTES PARK BERTHOUD
FT LUPTON		KEENESBURG
FRASER	4	KREMMLING GRAND LAKE
FREDERICK		COTTONWOOD
FRUITA	DELTA	
GARDNER	WESTCLIFFE	
GEORGETOWN	FRASER BRECKENRIDGE CENTRAL CITY	
GILCREST		MEAD
GLENWOOD SPRINGS		RIFLE SILT
GRANBY		KREMMLING
GRAND JUNCTION (INCL. CLIFTON)	14.	COLLBRAN MESA DEBEQUE PARACHUTE
GRAND LAKE		FRASER KREMMLING

WELDONA HUDSON

GREELEY

Appendix A I&S Docket No. 1766 Decision No. C89-998 July 19, 1989 Page 5 of 7

RANGELY/DINOSAUR

MEEKER

Exchange Name	DROPS	ADDS
		KEENESBURG MEAD
HOT SULPHUR SPRINGS		GRAND LAKE
HUDSON		LA SALLE GREELEY
JOHNSTOWN-MILLIKEN		MEAD
KEENESBURG		GREELEY LA SALLE
KREMMLING		GRAND LAKE FRASER
LA JARA		SAN LUIS
LA VETA	AGUILAR - WESTON	
LAKE GEORGE	FAIRPLAY	GRN MTN FALLS MANITOU SPRGS C.SMAIN C.SEAST C.SPIKEVIEW C.SSECURITY
LA SALLE		HUDSON KEENESBURG MEAD
LAS ANIMAS		LAMAR
LEADVILLE	FAIRPLAY	SALIDA
LOOKOUT MTN		BAILEY GEORGETOWN IDAHO SPRINGS
LOVELAND	WINDSOR	ESTES PARK MEAD
LYDNS		ESTES PARK

MAYBELL

Appendix A I&S Docket No. 1766 Decision No. C89-998 July 19, 1989 Page 6 of 7

Exchange Name	DROPS	ADDS
MEAD	FREDERICK	
MONTE VISTA		CREEDE SAGUACHE
MONTROSE		TELLURIDE NORWOOD CRESTED BUTTE
MORRISON		IDAHO SPRINGS
NEDERLAND		CENTRAL CITY
NORWOOD	OURAY	MONTROSE
OAK CREEK		YAMPA
PALISADE		COLLBRAN PARACHUTE
PARACHUTE	COLLBRAN MESA GLENWOOD SPGS NEWCASTLE SILT	GRAND JUNCTION
PARKER	3111	ELBERT KIOWA
PEYTON	Monument W.C.	C.S PIKEVIEW C.SMAIN C.SEAST AIR FORCE ACAD C.SSECURITY
PLATTEVILLE '		FORT LUPTON MEAD
PUEBLO MAIN & WE MAIN VINELAND	ST CCS-STRATMOOR CCS-FOUNTAIN FOWLER	FLORENCE CANON CITY

RANGELY/ DINOSAUR

SUNSET

FRUITA

WALSENBURG

Appendix A I&S Docket No. 1766 Decision No. C89-998 July 19, 1989 Page 7 of 7

Exchange Name		DROPS	ADDS	
	RED FEATHERS LKS		WALDEN	
	RIDGWAY		NORWOOD TELLURIDE	
	RIFLE	COLLBRAN		
	SALIDA SILVERTON	TELLURIDE	LEADVILLE OURAY BAYFIELD	
	STEAMBOAT SPGS		YAMPA	
	STERLING	OTIS	FT. MORGAN	
	TELLURIDE	SILVERTON	MONTROSE	
	TWO BUTTES		CAMPO	
	WALDEN	GRANBY HOT SULHUR SPGS KREMMLING	FT. COLLINS RED FEATHER LKS	
	WALSENBURG	PUEBLO-SUNSET	-	
	WARD		NEDERLAND	
	WESTCLIFFE	GARDNER		
	WESTON	LA VETA	BRANSON	
	YAMPA	KREMMLING	STEAMBOAT SPGS	

Appendix B I&S Docket No. 1766 Decision No. C89-998 July 19, 1989 Page 1 of 1

RATES FOR STAFF/OCC/USWC PROPOSAL

-- Increase Residential and Business rates for all lines, for each Rate Group equally.

		Rate				
Res	Lines	Increment	Revenue			
RG 1	223,597	\$0.11	\$295,148			
LF *	5,554	0.08	5,332			
RG 2	281,310	0.11	371,329			
LF *	4,768	0.08	4,577			
RG 3	679,852	0.11	897,405			
LF *	7,824	0.08	7,511	0.		
	2.4.5					
Bus		5	1,581,302			
						*
RG 1	61,251	\$0.32	\$235,204			Add'l Rev
RG 2	76,488	0.32	293,714		\$3,086,709	Recovered
RG 3	254,294	0.32	976,489	Target		
			1,505,407		(\$22,336)	Diff
			The second of the second		Mary Service S. D.	1000

^{*} Lifeline rates accounted for and shown.

Note: This rate design maintains the rate relationship between Res & Bus rates established in I & S 1766, Decision No. C89-178.